

CMEC Shaanxi
 CMEC Guizhou
 CMEC Fujian
 CMEC Shanxi
 CMEC Jilin
 CMEC Gansu
 CMEC Hainan
 CMEC Qinghai
 CMEC Chengdu
 CMEC Zengzhou
 CMEC Tsinan
 CMEC Nanjing
 CMEC Guangzhou
 CMEC Shijiazhuang
 CMEC Changsha
 CMEC Hefei
 CMEC Wuhan
 CMEC Hangzhou
 CMEC Shenyang
 CMEC Nanchang
 CMEC Kunming
 CMEC Harbin
 CMEC Xian
 CMEC Guiyang
 CMEC Fuzhou
 CMEC Taiyuan
 CMEC Changchun
 CMEC Lanzhou
 CMEC Haikou
 CMEC Xining
 CMEC Guangxi Zhuang
 CMEC Nei Monggol
 CMEC Xinjiang Uygur
 CMEC Ningxia Hui
 CMEC Xizang
 CMEC Nanning
 CMEC Hohhot
 CMEC Urumqi
 CMEC Yinchuan
 CMEC Lhasa
 CMEC Shanghai
 CMEC Beijing
 CMEC Tianjin
 China National Machinery Import and
 Export Corporation (CMC)
 Sichuan CMC
 Henan CMC
 Shandong CMC
 Jiangsu CMC
 Guangdong CMC
 Hebei CMC
 Hunan CMC
 Anhui CMC
 Hubei CMC
 Zhejiang CMC
 Liaoning CMC
 Jiangxi CMC
 Yunnan CMC
 Heilongjiang CMC
 Shaanxi CMC
 Guizhou CMC
 Fujian CMC
 Shanxi CMC
 Jilin CMC
 Gansu CMC
 Hainan CMC
 Qinghai CMC
 Chengdu CMC
 Zengzhou CMC

Tsinan CMC
 Nanjing CMC
 Guangzhou CMC
 Shijiazhuang CMC
 Changsha CMC
 Hefei CMC
 Wuhan CMC
 Hangzhou CMC
 Shenyang CMC
 Nanchang CMC
 Kunming CMC
 Harbin CMC
 Xian CMC
 Guiyang CMC
 Fuzhou CMC
 Taiyuan CMC
 Changchun CMC
 Lanzhou CMC
 Haikou CMC
 Xining CMC
 Guangxi Zhuang CMC
 Nei Monggol CMC
 Xinjiang Uygur CMC
 Ningxia Hui CMC
 Xizang CMC
 Nanning CMC
 Hohhot CMC
 Urumqi CMC
 Yinchuan CMC
 Lhasa CMC
 Shanghai CMC
 Beijing CMC
 Tianjin CMC

Countervailing Duty Proceedings

None.

Suspension Agreements

None.

During any administrative review covering all or part of a period falling between the first and second or third and fourth anniversary of the publication of an antidumping duty order under section 351.211 or a determination under section 351.218(f)(4) to continue an order or suspended investigation (after sunset review), the Secretary, if requested by a domestic interested party within 30 days of the date of publication of the notice of initiation of the review, will determine, whether antidumping duties have been absorbed by an exporter or producer subject to the review if the subject merchandise is sold in the United States through an importer that is affiliated with such exporter or producer. The request must include the name(s) of the exporter or producer for which the inquiry is requested.

Interested parties must submit applications for disclosure under administrative protective orders in accordance with 19 CFR 351.305.

These initiations and this notice are in accordance with section 751(a) of the Tariff Act of 1930, as amended (19 U.S.C. 1675(a)) and 19 CFR 351.221(c)(1)(i).

Dated: July 28, 2000.

Holly A. Kuga,

*Acting Deputy Assistant Secretary, Group II
 for Import Administration.*

[FR Doc. 00-19285 Filed 7-28-00; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 3510-DS-P

DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

International Trade Administration

[A-570-847]

Persulfates From the People's Republic of China: Final Results of Antidumping Duty Administrative Review and Partial Rescission of Administrative Review

AGENCY: Import Administration, International Trade Administration, Department of Commerce.

ACTION: Notice of final results of antidumping duty administrative review.

SUMMARY: On April 10, 2000, the Department of Commerce published the preliminary results of its second administrative review of the antidumping duty order on persulfates from the People's Republic of China. The merchandise covered by this order are persulfates, including ammonium, potassium, and sodium persulfates. The period of review is July 1, 1998, through June 30, 1999.

We have determined that sales of subject merchandise by Shanghai Ai Jian Import & Export Corporation have been made below normal value during the period of review. This review has now been rescinded with respect to Sinochem Jiangsu Wuxi Import & Export Trade Corporation.

EFFECTIVE DATE: July 31, 2000.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT:

James Nunno or Shawn Thompson, AD/CVD Enforcement Group I, Office II, Import Administration, International Trade Administration, U.S. Department of Commerce, 14th Street and Constitution Avenue, NW., Washington, DC 20230; telephone: (202) 482-0783 or (202) 482-1776, respectively.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:

The Applicable Statute and Regulations

Unless otherwise indicated, all citations to the Tariff Act of 1930, as amended (the Act), are references to the provisions effective January 1, 1995, the effective date of the amendments made to the Act by the Uruguay Round Agreements Act (URAA). In addition, unless otherwise indicated, all citations to the Department of Commerce's (the Department's) regulations are to 19 CFR Part 351 (1998).

Background

On August 6, 1999, the Department published the preliminary results of administrative review of the antidumping duty order on persulfates from the People's Republic of China (PRC). *See Persulfates from the People's Republic of China: Preliminary Results of Antidumping Duty Administrative Review, and Partial Rescission of Administrative Review*, 65 FR 18963 (April 10, 2000) (*Preliminary Results*). We gave interested parties an opportunity to comment on our preliminary results but received no comments. We are rescinding this review with respect to Sinochem Jiangsu Wuxi Import & Export Trade Corporation (Wuxi) because Wuxi reported no shipments and entry data provided by the Customs Service confirms that there were no period of review (POR) entries of persulfates sold by Wuxi. The Department has conducted this administrative review in accordance with section 751 of the Act.

Scope of Review

The products covered by this review are persulfates, including ammonium, potassium, and sodium persulfates. The chemical formula for these persulfates are, respectively, $(\text{NH}_4)_2\text{S}_2\text{O}_8$, $\text{K}_2\text{S}_2\text{O}_8$, and $\text{Na}_2\text{S}_2\text{O}_8$. Ammonium and potassium persulfates are currently classified under subheading 2833.40.60 of the Harmonized Tariff Schedule of the United States (HTSUS). Sodium persulfate is classified under HTSUS subheading 2833.40.20. Although the HTSUS subheadings are provided for convenience and customs purposes, our written description of the scope of this review is dispositive.

Separate Rates

Shanghai Ai Jian Import & Export Corporation (Ai Jian) has requested a separate, company-specific antidumping duty rate. In our *Preliminary Results*, we found that Ai Jian had met the criteria for the application of a separate antidumping duty rate. *See* 65 FR at 18964. We have not received any other information since the preliminary results which would warrant reconsideration of our separate rates determination with respect to this company. We therefore determine that Ai Jian in this administrative review should be assigned an individual dumping margin.

With respect to Guangdong Petroleum Chemical Import & Export Trade Corporation (Guangdong Petroleum), which did not respond to the Department's questionnaire, we determine that this company does not

merit a separate rate. The Department assigns a single rate to companies in a non-market economy, unless an exporter demonstrates an absence of government control. We determine that Guangdong Petroleum is subject to the country-wide rate for this case because it failed to demonstrate an absence of government control.

Use of Facts Available

As explained in the preliminary results, the use of facts available is warranted in this case because Guangdong Petroleum, which is part of the PRC entity (*see* "Separate Rates" section above), has failed to respond to the original questionnaire and has refused to participate in this administrative review. Therefore, in accordance with sections 776(a)(2)(A) and (C) of the Act, we find that the use of total facts available is appropriate for the PRC-wide rate. Furthermore, in the preliminary results we determined that Guangdong Petroleum did not cooperate to the best of its ability with our requests for necessary information. Therefore, in accordance with section 776(b) of the Act, we applied adverse inferences when selecting among the facts available. As adverse facts available in this proceeding, in accordance with the Department's practice, we preliminarily assigned Guangdong Petroleum and all other exporters subject to the PRC-wide rate the petition rate of 119.02 percent, which is the PRC-wide rate established in the less than fair value (LTFV) investigation, and the highest dumping margin determined in any segment of this proceeding. As explained in the preliminary results, we determined that this margin was corroborated in accordance with section 776(c) of the Act in the LTFV investigation. *See Preliminary Results*, 65 FR at 18964–5. We have determined that no evidence on the record warrants revisiting this issue in these final results, and no interested party submitted comments on our use of adverse facts available. Accordingly, we continue to use the petition rate from the LTFV investigation of 119.02 percent.

Changes Since the Preliminary Results

Based on determinations in recent PRC cases, we have made certain changes in the margin calculation for Ai Jian. These changes are as follows:

Labor: We valued labor based on the regression-based wage rate for 1998 in accordance with 19 CFR 351.408(c)(3). For purposes of the preliminary results we used the 1997 data because more recent data was not yet available.

Electricity: We derived a surrogate value for electricity based on electricity price data published by the Center for Monitoring Indian Economy and the Conference of Indian Industries, on an electricity-specific price index published by the Reserve Bank of India. These data were recently used in the antidumping duty administrative review of manganese metal from the PRC. *See Notice of Final Results of Antidumping Duty Administrative Review of Manganese Metal from the People's Republic of China*, 65 FR 30067, 30067–8 (May 10, 2000); *Final Results Factors Valuation Memorandum from the Team to the File*, July 25, 2000.

Final Results of the Review

We determine that the following percentage weighted-average margins exist for the period July 1, 1998 through June 30, 1999:

Manufacturer/exporter	Margin (percent)
Shanghai Ai Jian Import & Export Corporation	2.62
PRC-wide Rate	119.02

The Department shall determine, and Customs shall assess, antidumping duties on all appropriate entries. In accordance with 19 CFR 351.212(b), we have calculated exporter/importer-specific assessment rates. With respect to export price sales, we aggregated the dumping margins for the reviewed sales and divided this amount by the total quantity of those sales for each importer. We will direct Customs to assess the resulting unit margins against the entered Customs quantities for the subject merchandise on each of that importer's entries under the relevant order during the review period.

Cash Deposit Requirements

The following deposit requirements will be effective upon publication of this notice of final results of this antidumping duty administrative review for all shipments of persulfates from the PRC entered, or withdrawn from warehouse, for consumption on or after the date of publication, as provided by section 751(a)(1) of the Act: (1) The cash deposit rate for Ai Jian will be the rate shown above; (2) for previously reviewed or investigated companies not listed above that have separate rates, the cash deposit rate will continue to be the company-specific rate published for the most recent period; (3) the cash deposit rate for all other PRC exporters, including Guangdong Petroleum, will be 119.02 percent, the PRC-wide rate established in the LTFV investigation; and (4) the cash deposit rate for non-

PRC exporters of subject merchandise from the PRC will be the rate applicable to the PRC supplier of that exporter.

These deposit requirements shall remain in effect until publication of the final results of the next administrative review.

This notice also serves as a final reminder to importers of their responsibility under 19 CFR 351.402(f) to file a certificate regarding the reimbursement of antidumping duties prior to liquidation of the relevant entries during this review period. Failure to comply with this requirement could result in the Secretary's presumption that reimbursement of antidumping duties occurred and the subsequent assessment of doubled antidumping duties.

This notice also serves as the only reminder to parties subject to administrative protective orders (APO) of their responsibility concerning the return or destruction of proprietary information disclosed under APO in accordance with 19 CFR 351.305 or conversion to judicial protective order is hereby requested. Failure to comply with the regulations and terms of an APO is a violation which is subject to sanction.

We are issuing and publishing this determination and notice in accordance with sections section 751(a)(1) and 771(i) of the Act.

Dated: July 25, 2000.

Troy H. Cribb,

Acting Assistant Secretary for Import Administration.

[FR Doc. 00-19284 Filed 7-28-00; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 3510-DS-P

DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

International Trade Administration

[A-588-845]

Stainless Steel Sheet and Strip in Coils From Japan: Notice of Initiation and Preliminary Results of Changed Circumstance Antidumping Duty Review, and Intent To Revoke Order in Part

AGENCY: Import Administration, International Trade Administration, Department of Commerce.

ACTION: Notice of initiation and preliminary results of changed circumstance antidumping duty review, and intent to revoke order in part.

SUMMARY: On October 22, 1999, the Department of Commerce (the Department) received a request on behalf of Techni Edge Manufacturing Co. ("Techni Edge") for a changed

circumstance antidumping duty (AD) review and an intent to revoke in part the AD order with respect to specific stainless steel sheet and strip from Japan. On May 9, 2000, Techni Edge submitted further information in support of its request. The Department received a letter on May 12, 2000, from petitioners (Allegheny Ludlum, AK Steel (formerly Armco, Inc.), Washington Steel Division of Bethlehem Steel Corporation (formerly Lukens, Inc.), the United Steelworkers of America, AFL-CIO/CLC, the Butler Armco Independent Union and the Zanesville Armco Independent Organization, Inc.) indicating that they do not oppose Techni Edge's request for revocation in part of the order pursuant to a changed circumstance review with respect to the subject merchandise defined in the Scope of the Review section below.

Interested parties are invited to comment on these preliminary results.

EFFECTIVE DATE: July 31, 2000.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT:

Sally C. Gannon or James C. Doyle, Import Administration, International Trade Administration, U.S. Department of Commerce, 14th Street and Constitution Avenue, N.W., Washington D.C. 20230; telephone (202) 482-0162 and (202) 482-0159, respectively.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:

Applicable Statute and Regulations

Unless otherwise indicated, all citations to the statute are references to the provisions effective January 1, 1995, the effective date of the amendments made to the Tariff Act of 1930 (the Act) by the Uruguay Round Agreements Act (URAA). In addition, unless otherwise indicated, all citations to the Department's regulations are to the regulations at 19 CFR Part 351.

Background

On July 27, 1999, the Department published the Notice of Amended Final Determination of Sales at Less Than Fair Value and Antidumping Duty Order on stainless steel sheet and strip from Japan (64 FR 40565).

On October 22, 1999, and May 9, 2000, Techni Edge requested revocation in part of the AD order pursuant to section 751(b) of the Act with respect to specific stainless steel sheet and strip in coils from Japan, as described below.

Scope of the Review

The product covered by this exclusion request is certain stainless steel used for razor blades, medical surgical blades, and industrial blades and sold under proprietary names such as DSRIK7,

DSRIK8, and DSRIK9. This stainless steel strip in coils is a specialty product with a thickness of 0.15 mm to 1.000 mm, or 0.006 inches to 0.040 inches, and a width of 6 mm to 50 mm, or 0.250 inches to 2.000 inches. The edge of the product is slit, and the finish is bright.

The steel contains the following chemical composition by weight:

Carbon 0.65% to 1.00%
Silicon 1.00% maximum
Manganese 1.00% maximum
Phosphorus 0.35% maximum
Sulfur 0.25% maximum
Nickel 0.35% maximum
Chromium 0.15% maximum
Molybdenum 0.30% maximum

Initiation and Preliminary Results of Changed Circumstance AD Review, and Intent to Revoke Order in Part

At the request of Techni Edge, and in accordance with sections 751(d)(1) and 751(b)(1) of the Act and section 351.216 of the Department's regulations, the Department is initiating a changed circumstance review of stainless steel sheet and strip from Japan to determine whether partial revocation of the AD order is warranted with respect to the stainless steel sheet and strip subject to this request. Section 782(h)(2) of the Act and section 351.222(g)(1)(i) of the Department's regulations provide that the Department may revoke an order (in whole or in part) if it determines that producers accounting for substantially all of the production of the domestic like product have no further interest in the order, in whole or in part. In addition, in the event the Department determines that expedited action is warranted, section 351.221(c)(3)(ii) of the regulations permits the Department to combine the notices of initiation and preliminary results.

In accordance with section 751(b) of the Act, and sections 351.222(g)(1)(i) and 351.221(c)(3) of the Department's regulations, we are initiating this changed circumstance review and have determined that expedited action is warranted. Our decision to expedite this review stems from the domestic industry's lack of interest in applying the AD order to the specific stainless steel sheet and strip covered by this request. Additionally, in accordance with section 351.216(a) we find that the petitioners' affirmative statement of no interest constitutes good cause for the conduct of this review.

Based on the expression of no interest by petitioners and absent any objection by any other domestic interested parties, we have preliminarily determined that substantially all of the domestic producers of the like product have no interest in continued application of the